

REMARKS

Claims 1, 4, and 16-21 are amended. Claims 1-22 are now pending in the application. Support for the amendment to Claim 1 can be found at least within paragraph [0046]. Support for the amendment to Claim 4 can be found at least within paragraph [0052]. The amendments to the claims as indicated herein do not add any new matter to this application. Each issue raised in the Office Action mailed January 28, 2008 is addressed hereinafter, in order of appearance.

I. INTERVIEW SUMMARY

Applicants thank the examiner for the courtesy of a personal interview, which was held at the USPTO on April 8, 2008. Christopher J. Palermo represented Applicant. Andrea Long and Douglas Hutton represented the USPTO.

The parties discussed claim 1, FIG. 2D, the general nature of the disclosure, the Dell reference, and the Blakely-Fogel reference. The parties generally discussed how to advance prosecution and what parts of the claims could be addressed to more clearly distinguish over the Dell reference. The USPTO appeared to agree that Dell does not show “action mechanisms” in the nature of the “Fix It” action mechanism of FIG. 2D, because Dell’s arrow buttons are for navigation among pages only and do not initiate corrective action. Applicant argued that Blakely-Fogel does not provide a display of non-conforming parameters, errors or other differences in configuration information, and that the references in combination do not show displaying configuration errors in combination with action mechanisms that can initiate configuration changes to correct the configuration errors automatically. No agreement was reached with respect to allowability.

II. ISSUES RELATING TO PRIOR ART—CLAIMS 1-5, 9-11

Claims 1-5 and 9-11 stand rejected under 35 USC 103 as being unpatentable over Dell in view of Blakely-Fogel.

In rejecting Claim 1, the Office Action asserts that Blakely-Fogel teaches “after the user selecting to compare the configuration file with a knowledge base, a user interface is presented to display knowledge needed to correct the errors” (Office Action, page 4, first two lines). This assertion is respectfully traversed.

First, the quoted language is not recited in Claim 1. The Office Action appears to reject subject matter other than what Applicant claims. Further, the quoted language does not accurately characterize Blakely-Fogel, which does not disclose a configuration file whatsoever.

The Office Action cites Blakely-Fogel’s col. 2, lines 18-25 (Office Action, page 3, last paragraph) but apparently only for background and foundation. The cited section of Blakely-Fogel discusses a knowledge base, a control, current data, a user interface, and rule-based information tables. However, no information is given as to how these items correspond to the method recited in Claim 1.

As best understood by applicants, the Office Action apparently asserts that Blakely-Fogel’s current data 50 corresponds with the claimed first configuration, and Blakely-Fogel’s knowledge base 20 corresponds with the claimed second configuration. Blakely-Fogel’s control 30 accesses a current data base 50, and displays that current data base 50 as options to a user (col. 4, lines 51-53). Then, Blakeley-Fogel’s user makes a selection, the control 30 applies to that selection to the knowledge base 20, and if the selection cannot be applied, the user is informed of a rule in the knowledge base through a user interface 40 (col. 5, lines 1-6). However, Blakely-Fogel has no indication that a user ever sees errors in the current data, or a comparison of correct data to current data, and thus cannot suggest the claimed “displaying the comparison information.” The rules that are provided to the user in Blakely-Fogel are not comparisons.

To correct an error in input, the approach of Blakely-Fogel requires a user to manually compare the user's prior input to the rule that Blakely-Fogel displays, manually formulate correct input, and manually provide new input that hopefully conforms to the rule. Dell provides a side-by-side comparison of configuration files without pinpointing non-conformances or errors. In sharp contrast, in the example of FIG. 2D, Applicant's approach advances the art by displaying specific non-conformances in configuration files and, for each non-conformance, providing an associated action mechanism which when activated will cause automatic changes to correct the non-conformance. A combination of the references fails to suggest this approach or the claimed approach.

For at least the above reasons, the rejection of Claim 1 is unsupported and should be withdrawn.

Present claim 4 clarifies that different action mechanisms have separate properties and characteristics and perform separate changes to the first configuration file. For example, as shown in FIG. 2D of the disclosure, the "Fix It" check-boxes each activate a different kind of change to address a different non-conformance in the comparison information. The "Fix It" action mechanisms of FIG. 2D are only one example of the claimed action mechanisms.

For at least the above reasons, the rejection of Claim 4 is unsupported and should be withdrawn.

All remaining Claims were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as allegedly obvious over a variety of references using Dell and Blakely-Fogel as base references. However, all of these Claims either explicitly recite or depend from other Claims which recite elements or steps which as shown above are neither disclosed nor suggested by any combination of prior art, either by Dell and Blakely-Fogel or by any other reference. The secondary references do not cure this deficiency of Dell and Blakely-Fogel, and therefore any combination of Dell and Blakely-Fogel

with any of the secondary references cannot provide the complete combination of features recited in the remaining claims.

For the reasons set forth above, all of the pending claims are now in condition for allowance. The Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned relating to any issue that would advance examination of the present application.

A petition for extension of time, to the extent necessary to make this reply timely filed, is hereby made. If applicable, a check for the petition for extension of time fee and other applicable fees is enclosed herewith. If any applicable fee is missing or insufficient, throughout the pendency of this application, the Commissioner is hereby authorized charge to any applicable fees and to credit any overpayments to our Deposit Account No. 50-1302.

Respectfully submitted,
HICKMAN PALERMO TRUONG & BECKER LLP
/christophertanner#41518/

Dated: April 22, 2008

Christopher M. Tanner
Reg. No. 41,518

ctanner@hptb-law.com
2055 Gateway Place Suite 550
San Jose, California 95110-1093
Telephone No.: (408) 414-1238
Facsimile No.: (408) 414-1076